

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed on July 21, 2009. Applicants respectfully traverse all objections, rejections, and adverse assertions made by the Examiner. With this paper, claims 3-4, 7-10, 12-13, 17, 21, 63-64, and 67 have been amended and claims 1, 14-15, 18-20, 22-54, 61-62, and 65-66 have been canceled without prejudice. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 3-4, 7-13, 17, 21, 23-54, 63-64, and 67 are pending. Claims 23-54, 61, and 62 have been previously withdrawn and are now canceled. Claims 3-4, 7-13, 17, 21, 63-64, and 67 are currently pending and stand rejected. Favorable consideration of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 67 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As set forth below, claim 67 has been amended accordingly and amendments have been made such that the remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from allowable claim 67.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. It is asserted the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the limitation, “and further comprising a polymer sheath.” While Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection, in the interest of furthering prosecution in a timely manner, claim 17 has been amended to recite, “wherein the outer member is a polymer sheath disposed about the coil member, the tubular member, and at least a portion of the core member.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 67 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, it is asserted “the limitation ‘inner coil’ lacks sufficient antecedent basis.” Claim 67 has been amended

accordingly. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. Claim 67 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 7-15, 17-22, and 63-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of various art references.

While Applicants do not concede the correctness of these rejections, in the interest of furthering prosecution, claims 1, 14-15, 18-20, 22, and 65-66 have been canceled without prejudice rendering the rejection moot, and claims 3-4, 7-10, 12-13, 17, 21, 63-64 have been amended to depend from claim 67, which has been indicated as being in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Further examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at (612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVID J. PARINS et al.

By their attorney,

Date: 10-21-2009


J. Scot Wickhem, Reg. No. 41,376
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420
Telephone: (612) 677-9050
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349